

fw



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,496	11/27/2001	Tac-Duk Kim	1594.1017	8100

21171 7590 08/27/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SAYOC, EMMANUEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3746	

3746

DATE MAILED: 08/27/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/993,496	KIM, TAE-DUK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Emmanuel Sayoc	3746	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Emmanuel Sayoc. (3) Eric Berkowitz.
 (2) Justine Yu. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 August 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Yamamoto et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 8/26/03

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: During the interview the applicant explained the inventive concepts of the invention. All members of the party were in agreement with the scope of the invention. The prior art by Yamamoto et al. was discussed and all were in agreement with what the reference taught. The applicant argued that the reference did not teach a peak detection unit, a true peak associated with the piston displacement was not detected, and that the peak amplitude data was not reset. The applicant relied on a definition of "peak detector" from the McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms in addition to the specification of the claimed invention. The examiners hold that the reference teaches all the limitations of claim no. 1 as it is broadly presented. The examiners acknowledge that there is a distinction between the inventions which will bring the application in condition for allowance if properly reflected within the claims.